DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 364 FL 022 041

AUTHOR Gonzalez, Andrew
TITLE From English to Filipino: Training Teachers for the Great Shift in Social Studies in the Philippines.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 16p.; In: Sadtono, Eugenius, Ed. Issues in Language Teacher Education. Anthology Series 30; see FL 022 033.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Educational Change; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *English; Foreign Countries; Government Role; Instructional Materials; *Language of Instruction; Language Standardization; Program Implementation; *Social Studies; *Tagalog; *Teacher Education; Teaching Models; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Philippines

ABSTRACT

This article describes the shift from English to Filipino (Tagalog) as the language of instruction in elementary social studies education in the Philippines, focusing on the Philippines Department of Education's efforts to implement pre-service and in-service teacher training programs to expedite the change. In 1974 the Department of Education adopted a plan to switch from monolingual (English) to bilingual (English and Filipino) education at the elementary and secondary education levels, to be adopted over a 10-year period. The most pressing needs for successful implementation of the program were: (1) the production of teaching materials and texts in Filipino; (2) the modernization of the Filipino language itself; and (3) a theoretical framework and model for training teachers. Implications for the introduction of bilingual and indigenous language education in other nations is also discussed. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 370 364

FROM ENGLISH TO FILIPINO: TRAINING TEACHERS FOR THE GREAT SHIFT IN SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Andrew Gonzalez, FSC

Introduction

When the Department of Education in the Philippines decided to adopt a bilingual education scheme in 1974, one of the most formidable problems that it faced was to train teachers for the shift from English to Filipino as the medium of instruction in Social Studies, first at the elementary school level, subsequently at the secondary school level. It presribed a ten-year time-table, giving non-Tagalog speaking regions a grace-period of four years (1974-1978) to implement the program.

The shift was to be completed from a monolingual (in English) system to a bilingual one (Filipino and English) in ten years (1974-1984) (see Gonzalez and Sibayan 1988). Under the bilingual education scheme, Mathematics, Science and Communication Arts in English would be taught in English; all other subjects would be taught in Tagalog-based Filipino, the national language. The most important content-area subject in the curriculum under the domain of Filipino was Social Studies (*Araling Panlipunan*). The rest of the content-area subjects were in the performing arts (music, art education, physical education, work education) and in Communication Arts in Filipino. The shift in the performing arts was relatively easy since it meant switching to the everyday language used as a lingua franca in giving instructions in these classes; since the classes involved were elementary classes, with the implementation year-by-year, the efforts needed for the shift were relatively easy to educe. Far more difficult was the task of teaching Social Studies in Filipino, from English.

The purpose of this paper is to describe the experience of the last eighteen years in making this shift, especially in the Department's efforts at pre-service and in-service training of Social Studies teachers who would henceforth use Filipino as the medium of instruction in their content teaching.

FL022041

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Wong Kim Weng
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The problems arose not only from the shift but the status of development of Filipino itself as a language of content teaching (see Philippine Journal of Linguistics 1988 issue on the subject of the intellectualization of Filipino).

A similar experience of difficulty and various attempts or strategies at meeting such a difficulty may be found in other countries which have shifted to a bilingual or monolingual scheme in the local language.

Were the language towards which teaching was to be shifted a fully developed language (for example, in bilingual schemes in Canada involving two developed languages, English and French, and in the United States, English and Spanish, among others), the difficulties would have been minimized. The problem involved the shift to a language which was in itself in a process of development as an intellectualized language or a language of scholarly discourse.

The Philippine experience thus has far wider implications beyond the country, for similar problems have undoubtedly arisen for Indonesia and Malaysia using Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Malaysia, respectively; one foresees the same problem arising in the Indo-Chinese states (Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos) if local official languages are used for education instead of French.

Based on the Philippine experience, some insights may be gained for applications in teacher training in countries undergoing rapid political and social evolution.

The Philippine Experience

When the Department of Education of the Republic of the Philippines promulgated Department Order No. 25, series 1974, calling for the teaching of Social Studies in Tagalog-based Filipino in Grade One, with the program continuing each year thereafter and expanding to higher grades, the most pressing needs for the implementation of the program were the production of teaching materials in Filipino in what was then known as Pilipino and the training of teachers to switch from English to Pilipino in the medium for social studies (see Gonzalez 1984).

In addition to seminars being held all over the country informing teachers in the field about the new policy, special seminars and workshops were held for the teaching of social studies in Pilipino. These workshops consisted for the most part

of demonstration lessons in addition to information sessions on the requirements of the new bilingual education scheme.

Other than the lack of materials for a large number of students, materials which began to be written during the workshops mentioned and circulated through mimeographed notes, there were few teacher problems in Tagalog areas since teachers easily shifted from English to Pilipino in the teaching of social studies at the primary school level (Grades 1 to 4).

Prior to the 1974 scheme and independently of it, the Marcos Government, based on a survey of the entire educational system in 1969 and reported in 1970 (PCSPE 1970), contracted a large World Bank loan to improve the educational system. A very important component of this loan was the production of textbooks in all subjects and all grades (from Grade One to Fourth Year High School) to an extent where there would be one book for every two pupils (from what was then the sad state of one book per ten pupils). With the 1974 bilingual education scheme, the social studies textbooks (initially written in English up to approximately Grade 4) had to be translated and adapted into Filipino. There was thus a time-lag between the implementation of the program and the provision of teaching materials in Filipino in the Social Studies area because of the switch; mimeographed notes on a district basis, done by the teachers, had to be used or materials in English continued to be used with the classes conducted in Filipino.

An interim evaluation on program implementation throughout the country, now divided into regions for administrative purposes, was carried out in 1978 through a national conference (see Gonzalez 1979) to receive oral reports from Supervisors of Pilipino and Social Studies on the status of implementation. In the Tagalog speaking regions, implementation was going on even ahead of schedule in the sense that in some districts, Filipino was already being used beyond Grade 4. In others, especially in non-Tagalog regions, the implementation was behind schedule; in some schools (especially private schools), implementation had not yet even begun; and in Cebuano-speaking areas, especially Cebu itself, there was resistance to implementation.

Designated as centers for teacher training on the use of Filipino as the medium of instruction was Philippine Normal College (now Philippine Normal University), a state teacher training institution, and National Teachers College, a private institution--both in Manila. Local and regional workshops at various levels continued to be carried out (see Gonzalez 1984 for a review of evaluative studies of implementation of the program in various areas of the country).

The biggest limitation in these teacher training programs, consisting for the most part of three or five-day workshops, was that there was no clear-cut methodology or strategy on exactly how the shift was to be brought about most efficiently and with the least amount of inconvenience for both pupils and above all for teachers, some of whom did not feel sufficiently confident to make the switch.

The training sessions consisted of the following: lectures on the policy itself and its requirements; demonstration lessons by linguistically talented teachers who knew both the subject matter and were versatile in using Filipino as a medium of instruction; the preparation of lesson plans and materials in Filipino which were then circulated throughout the district or the division.

The basic problem in the training program was that it had no theoretical underpinnings but was a case of 'learning by doing'. Under the circumstances, this was probably the only way to conduct the training since there were no precedents in the country for the shift. What different applied linguists called for in various forums was the beginning of a research project to discover the components of a theoretical model. In addition, as the summative evaluation of the program after 11 years advised (see Gonzalez and Sibayan 1988), a research program on dovetailing and syllabi for English and Filipino would avoid needless repetition and make room for more advanced work; a teaching guide with materials and with a theoretical framework was likewise suggested for the teaching of Filipino to non-Tagalogs. Although the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS) received these recommendations with an open mind and even constituted a permanent Bilingual Education Monitoring Group at DECS, including a promise of a special item in the budget for these projects, other priorities soon took over and more pressing tasks for the DECS administrators multiplied, relegating the projects to dormancy.

In the meantime, after 1974, two new projects of DECS took place, again with funding from foreign agencies: an attempt to improve elementary education by streamlining the curriculum and reducing the subjects; subsequently under a new Secretary, values education was likewise stressed as part of the content of a program known as Program for Decentralized Educational Development (PRODED). This involved a rewriting of textbooks for Grades 1 to 6 and most important of all, a heavy teacher training component on how to use these materials. Subsequently, as a continuation of PRODED, a Secondary Education Development Program (SEDP) was likewise started, again with a simplification of the secondary school curriculum, materials for the curricular change, and teacher training. Initially the teacher training component involved both public and private schools; eleven days of training for private school teachers and twenty days for public school teachers. The program has been curtailed to fifteen days in 1992 (See DECS 1992).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

At the secondary level, where the problems of transition to Filipino from English for the teaching of Philippine History and Government, Asian History and Civilization, Basic Economics, and World History and Civilization were much greater because of the special register needed for these subjects, the training programs stressed content more than methodology and in effect consisted of imparting content on the new textbooks by way of a regular class for teachers, with opportunities for translating what they had learned into actual lesson plans and modules for the students. However, in the case of economics, because of the inability of some of the university-based economics professors to lecture in Filipino, the content teaching had to be done in English -- a step which was really going against the successful implementation of the new program in economics from the point of view of building language competence in an intellectualized variety of Filipino for the content area.

Based on survey data gathered in the Bilingual Education Scheme evaluation (conducted in 1985 but reported officially by a 1988 publication: Gonzalez and Sibayan 1988), and confirmed by later informal reports, there is still much use of English going on in the teaching of the social sciences at the secondary level, especially in a quantitatively oriented subject like Economics. Other schools attempting to implement the program according to exact specifications use a code-switching strategy for language use in the classrooms. Materials are now slowly coming to the market for the private sector for history, Asian civilization, World History (in Filipino), but there is thus far only one Economics book in Filipino in the market, with a second one in press. In the private sector, not all the SEDP books have been printed; circulation is still a problem. The teacher re-training (in-service) goes on during mid-term vacations and during the long vacation, now reduced to three weeks.

In pre-service training programs for teachers, where the recommendation was made by the evaluators in 1988 to use Filipino as the medium of instruction for the content subjects in Social Studies especially for those teachers planning to become social studies/social science teachers, there has been little implementation because of the reluctance of senior faculty to make the switch. This is the situation at present even at the premier teacher training institution in the country, the Philippine Normal University. The problem is compounded in non-Tagalog regions, where professors in colleges of education teaching social sciences plead inability to use Filipino as the medium of instruction in their courses because they are non-Tagalogs.

The only university in the Philippines which has started a program of eventually using Filipino as the medium of instruction for all undergraduate courses that are not language subjects is the University of the Philippines (Diliman Campus), which set for itself a time-table of five years (1987-1992). A Center for Language (Sentro ng Wika) has been established with a full-time staff to encourage and assist university teachers in the use of Filipino as the medium of instruction in their subjects. In addition to short-term seminars of an informational nature, the Center has been using the following means: encouragement of textbook writing using Filipino; word lists; newsletters, translations and research projects. The actual training of the professors has not yet been implemented. The pace of implementation has slowed down recently, with the 1992 target seemingly an unrealistic one. Undoubtedly the time table will have to be modified and the original deadline extended.

Practical Insights from the Philippine Experience:

The Need for a Theoretical Model for Re-training Teachers for the Shift from the Use of English to Filipino.

The training of teachers thus far in the Philippines, both at the pre-service and in-service stages, with regard to the shift of Filipino from English in the social sciences has been a matter of 'feel' or groping for a methodology without a theory. This problem is not unique to the Philippines and was faced earlier by Indonesia and Malaysia when they switched to the use of Bahasa Indonesia/Malaysia as the medium of instruction from the colonial languages, Dutch/English. A similar problem occurred at Nanyang University when its professors had to switch from Mandarin to English. It is a problem being faced by Bilingual Education Schemes in the United States where certain subjects have to be taught by ethnic American-Hispanics in Spanish when they were teaching the same subject matter originally in English.

The main difference between the Western experience and the experiences of the Philippines and Indonesia/Malaysia is that in the West, when there was a shift, it was usually a shift from one developed language to another with the target language at the same level of modernization and intellectualization as the original language because of the target language's wide use in the mother country or elsewhere as an intellectualized language. One thinks of the shift from English to French in Montreal's bilingual scheme or the shift from English to Spanish in North American bilingual schemes.

The situation is not the same for Bahasa Indonesia/Malaysia and Filipino and for that matter, Guarani in Paraguay or Quechua in Bolivia, since here we are moving from a modernized intellectualized language albeit a second or foreign one to a local one which is still undergoing modernization and intellectualization.

We are thus dealing with two problems simultaneously: the problem of shifting from one code to another and the more difficult problem of modernizing the language to which one is shifting, at the same time, since the two languages being switched are not at the same level of modernization and intellectualization.

Modernizing a Language

Far more difficult than merely shifting from a source language to a target language (even if the target language in this case is an indigenous language or even one which the teacher speaks as a native speaker), is the modernization of the target language, since in the case of newly developing languages such as Filipino and Malay, the standardized variety of the language is still in the process of formation; usually the colloquial or informal variety of the language is the one that one learns as a first language speaker. Yet what is needed is what Sibayan (1989) calls a pedagogical idiom, in this case, of Filipino.

The pedagogical idiom is that variety needed for classroom use or the use of language beyond merely the expressive and persuasive one for person-to-person interaction. It has to do with what Buhler (1934) calls the 'demonstrative function' or what M.A.K. Halliday (1975) calls the 'ideational function' of language to transmit information. The information in turn is not merely factual but a well organized body of knowledge presented in logical sequence, with its mode or argumentation and the dominant paradigm of the discipline being assumed. Included here are what Bruner (1988) calls the operational principles of a particular subject of specialization and the prevailing conceptual structure of the discipline.

The pedagogical idiom thus involves not only the every-day language of classroom management, metalinguistic functional forms for moving the argument to the next stage and for signalling the beginning or ending of a topic, but a register-specific pedagogical idiom for a particular discipline, in this case, the social studies disciplines (interdisciplinary at the elementary level) and social sciences such as history, political science, economics, and cultural anthropology for the specific subjects prescribed in the Secondary Education Development Program (SEDP) Curriculum in the Philippines.

For such registers, one needs not only necessary terminology (a task that the Institute of National Language has done borrowing from the model of *istilahs* by the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka of Malaysia) but what Gonzalez (in press) has termed a 'reconceptualization' of the subject matter consisting of translation and restatement using basic concepts of the discipline and step by step build-up. In transformational terms, of the 1957 and 1965 vintage, one envisages breaking down the discourse into kernel sentences and then recombining these kernels into more complex structures in the new language, in this case, Filipino. This includes not only the full exploitation of the grammar of the language (morphology and syntax and even phonological units in some cases for mnemonic and onomatopoeic effects if the register calls for such effects) but likewise its discourse structure since what one is creating is texts and not merely sentences or even paragraphs.

Gonzalez (in press) has hypothesized that this reconceptualization is really the same process as translation except that in translation from developed languages, one already has the terminology and the rhetorical and register models. In the translation necessary for shifting from one language to another in teaching, if the target language is not a fully modernized one, one has the burden of searching for suitable terminology, sentential structures and discourse forms and the added burden of prior simplification. One must assume a zero language register at the beginning of the discourse and build up bit by bit. The first problem to solve is to select which terms to use since there is as yet no consensus among specialists in the discipline as to which terms are to be accepted; idiosyncratic coinages and creations are being circulated for currency by their proponents or word-makers. Moreover, beyond mere lexical creation, the modernization of a language and its intellectualization demand the creation of a register in Filipino for a special field. Sociologists of knowledge who have observed the process of the build-up of a discipline tell us that before such a register builds up, one needs a group of 'significant others' who interact with a leader to create texts in the discipline. Terminology must be accepted, a paradigm for the field adopted, and everyone in the circle of 'significant others' provides the *detaillisme* necessary for filling out the paradigm and eventually changing it if enough anomalies are uncovered (see Kuhn 1970 for an account of a typical paradigm shift). In the meantime, there is constant exchange of publications which are then read and accepted with their terminology and their working assumptions, hypotheses and conclusions, so that a school of thought is created among the group. If the same activity is going on elsewhere, then one will have different schools of thought which can then interact with each other to hasten the process of text build-up or corpus planning, during scholarly meetings and seminars. In turn, graduates belonging to a particular school of thought can propagate the findings and hypotheses of their respective schools by obtaining academic appointments in other centers, thus creating a wave-like effect to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

disseminate their findings. This process takes time and talent especially as it depends on the presence of a charismatic intellectual leader who can gather disciples around him to propagate his findings.

In the Philippines, in the field of psychology, there was a period when Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino Psychology) was in this state of ferment among the students of Professor Virgilio Enriquez at the Department of Psychology of the University of the Philippines. The school flourished in the 1970's and created a body of scholarly literature in Filipino which is still consulted and talked about, but it seems to have lost its momentum when Enriquez gave up the leadership of this group (see Enriquez and Marcelino) 1984.

The same kind of ferment for other disciplines, including social science disciplines, has not been found, since scholars in these other areas still carry on their intellectual discourse in English.

Reconceptualizing the Content of the Discipline in the New Language (Filipino)

The second major task of the teacher in this shift from English to Filipino, is to reconceptualize content in the target language (Filipino) based on expertise learned in content in English, a second language, using the modernized variety of Filipino now in the process of formation.

As Gonzalez (in press) has hypothesized, this process of reconceptualization is similar to translation and calls for the same types of skills. The translation will not be a surface structure to surface structure translation but will involve breaking down the semantic wholes into simpler units, perhaps at the clause level, and re-building the clauses into more complex sentences in the process of translation (synthesis). The important step in this process is the break-down of the macrosemantic units into smaller manageable units understandable to the neophyte and then building on these units by different semantic combinations which will be symbolized or expressed or realized by complex syntactic structures.

This kind of translation, consisting of translating highly complex and abstract displaced speech of non-contextualized written communication into simpler, perhaps less abstract, displaced speech or noncontextualized written communication for the easier understanding of the neophyte in secondary school, takes a special talent that not all individuals have, even if they happen to be versatile in English or in Filipino. Ability in translation is a talent by itself; there are good and there are poor translators. The problem in this case is that under the

new order of things every social science teacher in secondary schools and every social studies teacher in primary schools is expected to be a good translator as well as popularizer or simplifier of the content learned in English at a more abstract level. As in German scholarship, all teachers of social studies/social sciences in the Philippines must begin from the *Grund* and build up the content structure step-by-step through explanation of operational concepts and principles, to communicate the message in the new language.

This is a major undertaking for the teachers involved since the common experience of most teachers is that it is easy to teach content in the language in which one has learned that content, e.g., even Thai speakers of English find it more comfortable to explain applied mathematical concepts of engineering in English rather than in Thai, even though their Thai is much better in ordinary communication than their English, simply because they learned the content in engineering in English rather than Thai.

Wanted: A Theoretical Framework and Model for Training Teachers to Make the Shift.

As yet, there is no model existent, either in the Philippines or elsewhere, to provide the educational planner and the educational supervisor with a tried and validated means of training teachers of social studies/social sciences or any content subject to make the transition from English to Filipino. A similar difficulty arises undoubtedly when someone teaching content in English has to communicate the same in Malay.

Thus far, in the Philippine experience, the process of re-training teachers has had no theoretical framework; the training has been carried out by a process of trial-and-error and through some non-empirical quasi-intuitive guesses that a particular set of techniques might work.

Teacher-trainees then re-learn the concepts of the discipline in Filipino (repeating what they already know in English, assuming that they have the intellectual training for learning the subject matter in English; this is not always the case) by going through the actual process with the guidance and tutelage of a lecturer/discussant whose special talents include easy-to-comprehend communication of the subject matter in Filipino backed by adequate discipline competence. The teacher-trainors have had very little training themselves, but they have the aptitude and natural ability to make the shift even without elaborate

training; teachers having this special talent have been used as special trainers for these sessions.

In the meantime, materials for the content subject are prepared and disseminated and the materials made the subject of lectures by experts able to carry on the lectures and the discussions in Filipino, of varying variety and quality, with more or less extensive use of loanwords.

Assignments are given, to be written in Filipino; recitation in class and oral interaction is carried on in Filipino; the final tests are in Filipino.

As added assignments, teachers are asked to write lesson plans in Filipino using the distributed materials as models; these plans are shared among group members so that there are complete lesson plans for the entire set of materials, if the tasks assigned are accomplished.

The basic rule is that the more practice, the better competence and the easier the shift. Individual differences and aptitudes are expected, with some doing outstanding work and becoming role models, with others limping their way through the materials and using willingly or not a code-switching variety of English and Filipino. No measures thus far have been taken to gauge if practice indeed makes perfect by evaluating the longterm benefits of these training programs.

What is lacking at present, then, is a theoretical underpinning to the process, borrowing from psychology and communication theory as well as sociology.

Mention has already been made of the need for a ready set of terms and a ready set of texts for use. These lexical inventories and the text build-up are done by applied linguists and specialists in the field with both intellectual and language-use competence.

The terms and the texts must be accepted by a group of 'significant others' so that there will be people who understand what is written and said without new efforts at translation; the build-up for such acceptability is described in the literature on the sociology of knowledge; from these descriptions we may derive some generalizations based on past observations on how educational innovation and new concepts and principles spread in academia.

The psychology of language has not reached a stage when it can give rules and procedures for mastering discourse or text build-up in a language which one possesses as a native speaker but a variety of which one has not yet mastered. In fact, among native speakers, the process of mastering the scholarly register of their native languages is actually the process of education itself and takes several years of basic and specialized education. What saves the Filipino teacher from having to spend so much time is the fact that he is already a native speaker or at least a fluent speaker of a national lingua franca and its variety of colloquial speech and that he has already learned the content, albeit in English, a second language. He now has to backtrack, as it were, and re-express the same concepts in Filipino but in a variety of Filipino which has not yet been stabilized but is in the process of standardization. Psychology can describe what is happening and may even posit which parts of the brain are involved in the processing, including the process of translation itself. But it has not reached a stage when it can explain how this process takes place and why it is easier for some rather than for others, other than to state that some individuals have a better aptitude for this kind of activity more than others.

This is the state of the art at present. Beyond it we can only guess, intuit, and using cookbook techniques, combine necessary elements, process them, and hope they will work. We can evaluate the finished product by using a standardized measure of achievement or accomplishment.

Summary and Conclusion

In this exposition, I have attempted to describe the Philippine experience of classroom medium of instruction shift from English, a second language, to Filipino, either a first language or a lingua franca one soon learns in the community and in the school.

I have pointed out the problems involved in making the shift which are empirically verifiable through a series of attestations on the difficulties of implementing the bilingual education policy.

The problems arise from two separate though interrelated sources: the obvious problem of translating content from English to Filipino, presupposing prior mastery of the subject matter and a command of its prevailing paradigm, its methodology, its operational concepts and principles, and knowledge of its current findings; the more difficult problem of using a target language (Filipino) which though a first language for some or a second language which has been learned as a lingua franca by others and therefore one learnable even in a non-school

environment, has not been sufficiently modernized as a language of scholarly discourse. In the process of using this language, therefore, one is not only translating but attempting to create a new register and some texts in the target language. It is these two aspects which create difficulties for the teachers and not merely the problem of translation. The second process involves the creation of or acceptance of a terminological inventory in the process of acceptance or standardization and a style of discourse and rhetoric which is also in the process of formation, whose conventions have not yet been fixed, and whose general acceptability is still a matter of idiosyncratic choice.

Thus far, training to make the shift has considered in techniques of "learning by doing" using a cookbook approach without fully knowing if and why these techniques will work. There is a process of awareness build-up through lectures, exposure to some texts, materials production from these texts, use of these texts in lectures, and listening to lectures and participating in discussions and interacting with professors who through native talent have made the breakthrough and can communicate their abstract subject matter in Filipino. These are then the role models for teachers insofar as the shift is concerned.

The theoretical foundation for the success of the training program has yet to be spelled out, but its elements would call for principles and concepts from the psychology of language and the psychology of thought and translation, the sociology of knowledge and sociolinguistics, sociolinguistics applied to the process of language standardization and cultivation and most likely propagation or dissemination.

Teacher training to make the shift will require continuing research into the process described involving the findings of the background disciplines and borrowing from their methodologies to discover which techniques work and more importantly, if possible, why and how.

Conclusion

It is important to emphasize by way of conclusion that the Philippine problem I have described is found likewise in Malaysia and in Indonesia, although in these countries, there has been much more experience than in the Philippines. One suspects, too, that a similar problem exists for Thai, Putonghua, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian, wherever the langauge needs development in a special register, in the latter case, science and technology, for a language may have a rich

literary tradition without a scientific one. The latter will involve the same problems of text build-up, reconceptualization, and translation.

The findings from the experiences of these countries thus far indicate that language cultivation and elaboration is more than lexical coinage and the enrichment of the treasure trove of vocabulary or *Wortschatz* of the language. Nor is it even a matter of the acceptance of the terminological terms putatively proposed. The task is much more complicated because it calls for larger structures beyond the lexemes to macrostructures consisting of sentential compounds and discourse structures both written and oral, governed by both rhetorical conventions and the special language of science and technology, expressing both substantive content and methodologically accepted conventions or the prevailing paradigm and methodology of the discipline.

The process of reconceptualization and translation is more difficult for some than for others, depending on aptitude; this area of discourse needs further research as we have precious little data on this topic except the realization that it is difficult and that some are able to hurdle the difficulties better than others.

We have also to find out what kind of training exercises and activities will facilitate the acquisition of the skills of translation and register building in the new language. What facilitates or hinders the processes? Is there an optimal age when this can be done? Is it too late for shifting among senior teachers? Must our resources for training for the shift be concentrated among young teachers, especially in teacher-training colleges? How does one create and manage a climate of change where the new policy is acceptable and how does one manage change when the very people fighting the change are the senior faculty in these colleges of education who should themselves be the first ones to set the pace for the shift and give the example of willingness and eagerness?

Obviously, those of us involved in language teacher training and research in this area have our work cut out for us even into the next century.

REFERENCES

BRUNER, JEROME. (1988). Towards a Theory of Instruction. New York: W.W.Norton.

BUHLER, KARL. (1934). Sprachtheorie. Jena.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, CULTURE AND SPORTS. (1992). **Operation Handbook for In-service Training of Public and Private High School Teachers. Metro Manila: Secondary Education Development Program.**

ENRIQUEZ, VIRGILIO and E.P. MARCELINO. (1984). **Neo-colonial Politics and Language Struggle in the Philippines.** Quezon City: Akademiya at Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Philippine Psychology Research and Training House.

GONZALEZ, ANDREW, FSC. In press. **Reconceptualization, Translation and the Intellectualization of a Third World Language: The Case of Filipino.** In Sociolinguistics Today: International Perspective, ed. by Kingsley Bolton and Helen Kwok. Hong Kong: Routledge

_____. (1984). **Evaluating Bilingual Education Policy.** In Panagani Language Planning, Implementation and Evaluation. Essays in Honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan on his sixty-seventh birthday, ed. by A. Gonzalez, FSC, 46-65. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

_____. (1979). Evaluating the Program of Bilingual Education. PSSC Social Science Information 6.4.4-6.

_____ and BONIFACIO P. SIBAYAN, eds. (1988). Evaluating Bilingual Education in the Philippines (1974-1985). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1975). Learning How to Mean -- Explorations in the Development of Language. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.

KUHN, THOMAS S. (1970). Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

PCSPE (1970). Education Survey Report. Education for National Development, New Patterns, New Directions. Report of the Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education. Manila: DECS.

PHILIPPINE JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS. (1988). Special Issue: Setting Research Agenda for the Intellectualization of Filipino. A Theoretical Base for Teacher Training. PJL, 19.2 (December).

SIBAYAN, BONIFACIO P. (1989). Language Domains and the Development of Filipino. Perspective 9.3:24-27 and 9.4:26-31 (September and December).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE